DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 733 HE 005 803

AUTHOR Johnson, Jeffrey N.
TITLE University of Minnesota Faculty Participation in the University Without Walls.
INSTITUTION University Without Walls, Minneapolis, Minn.
PUB DATE 24 Jun 74
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Experimental Colleges; *External Degree Programs; *Higher Education; Research Projects; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *University of Minnesota; University Without Walls; UWW

ABSTRACT

This study offers a preliminary description of the faculty members at the University of Minnesota who have worked with University Without Walls (UWW) students outside of the conventional classroom setting. The American Council on Education Faculty questionnaire was sent to 141 university faculty members; 53 percent responded. Findings indicated: (1) University faculty participants in UWW are likely to be of senior rank. (2) On other demographic variables, UWW faculty do not differ significantly from the university faculty at large. (3) UWW faculty participants express greater interest in teaching than research, and the majority feel that a faculty member's teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary criterion for promotion and tenure. (4) Only 10 percent of the faculty prefer to rely only on the UWW model of one-to-one advising of the sort provided in UWW; most prefer a combination of teacher-student patterns of interactions. (5) The majority of respondents are in agreement with UWW's goals of helping students to learn how to learn and to achieve a liberal education. (6) The majority of respondents worked with more than one UWW student, and there is a tendency for individual university faculty members to be repeatedly contacted for service in UWW. Additional findings and conclusions are given. (MJM)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 095733

June 24, 1974

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

FACULTY PARTICIPATION in the UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(A Study made by Jeffrey N.Johnson)

Introduction

> . . . There is a large body of informed observation noting that the orientations and motivations of the general student body are not particularly congruent or compatible with (the) academic or intellectual demands of the faculty.
>
> . . . Students typically report little contact with them (faculty) and many students are often reasonably content to have it so.
>
> (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969)
>
> Teachers generally are not really very important in the lives of students.
>
> (Mayhew and Ford, 1971)
>
> It's reasonable to expect that the rapidly developing changes in American higher education in the past few years might have wrought tremendous changes in the composition, activities, and attitudes of faculty . . . this has not been the case.
>
> (Bayer, 1974)

and so the research goes. For the most part, variables other than faculty influence appear to be of greatest significance for the contemporary college student: the college professor simply doesn't seem to matter very much.[1]

[1] An exception to this lack of faculty influence appears in the area of students' education and career plans (see Feldman and Newcomb, p. 253-255.

HE 005 803

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Against this historic lack of faculty influence on students, the University Without Walls is seeking to provide new modes of student-faculty interaction in the belief that faculty do have important contributions to make to the undergraduate's experience; that many faculty themselves are seeking more personally satisfying relationships with their students; and that, to a great extent, real change in undergraduate education depends on faculty involvement - the types of faculty who choose to get involved, their reasons for participating, and how they feel about the experience.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study is to offer a preliminary description of the faculty members at the University of Minnesota who have worked with UWW students outside of the conventional classroom setting. The main aim of the study is to develop a descriptive data base on these faculty - their demographic characteristics, their values and attitudes, and the nature of their participation in UWW - in order to give a general understanding of who these faculty persons are, thus providing a solid base for additional and more in-depth studies.

Perhaps the study's main limitation is that it does not include evaluative data from students regarding the quality of faculty performance. Nor does the study include case studies of individual faculty. Such information would have put some flesh on the data-skeleton that is here provided and made the issues and persons come alive. At the same time, it appeared beyond the scope of a single monograph to pursue these additional perspectives.

Yet there are a number of existing questions which this study addresses. The University of Minnesota has 3,631 full-time and 1,170 part-time faculty members.[2] Of these, who are the faculty who choose to work with UWW students? Are they young or old? Do they come from the ranks of senior, tenured faculty, or are they persons new

[2] Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses only.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to the academic profession? How do they feel about the need for change at the University? What are their feelings about how UMM students compare to other undergraduates at the University? How do they feel about their involvement in UMM? Would they like to be involved again?

The present monograph offers some beginning answers to these and related questions.

Participants in the Study

Minnesota's UMM unit, founded in 1971, consists of 150 students, averaging 35 years of age, most of whom reside beyond commuting distance from campus. The students are persons who, while having clear learning objectives, are unable, because of jobs, families, etc., to pursue a conventional baccalaureate program. There are currently 40 graduates of the program. Minnesota's UMM unit includes three different types of faculty: 1) Learning facilitators, who comprise the central staff of UMM and provide general and comprehensive advising to students, especially in the area of self-directed study skill development; 2) Community faculty, who are persons from the non-academic sector, selected to serve as advisors for UMM students who are pursuing off-campus independent study projects (Johnson, 1974); and 3) University faculty, who are selected from the ranks of teaching faculty in any of the University's academic units and who serve as subject-matter advisors for students who are pursuing out of class (typically non-course related) independent study projects. The present study focuses on the latter group.

Included in this study are 75 University faculty members who served as independent study project advisors for UMM students during 1971-73. The actual number of University faculty who served during this period was 141. Of this number, a total of 66 (47 percent) either did not return the study questionnaire or returned it insufficiently completed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Instrument and Procedures

The questionnaire used in this study is an adaptation of the Faculty Questionnaire used by the American Council on Education in its survey of American College and University Faculty (Bayer 1970). The adaptation consists of 50 standard-response items, about one-third of which were derived from the ACE questionnaire, with the remainder designed specifically for the present study.

The questionnaire was sent with a self-addressed envelope for the respondent's use. Respondents did not sign their names, nor were code numbers used to identify respondents. A cover letter was supplied with each questionnaire, explaining the purpose of the study and asking for their participation. A reminder-memo was sent to all faculty who received the questionnaire about two weeks after the initial mailing.

Of the 57 items in the questionnaire, 7 items relate to demographic characteristics (age, sex, etc.); 10 items relate to the respondent's status within the University (e.g., appointment level, tenured/non-tenured, length of service, nature of regular job responsibilities, etc.); 7 items relate to the respondent's feelings about college in general and the University of Minnesota; 15 items relate to the respondent's functional relationship with UMM; 3 items relate to the respondent's feelings about his or her role in UMM; 3 items relate to the respondent's UMM involvement and his/her position in a regular academic unit of the University;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2 items relate to the respondent's feelings concerning remuneration for services rendered to UMM; 7 items relate to the respondent's feelings about the UMM students with whom they worked; and 3 items relate to the respondent's overall feelings about his or her involvement in UMM.

Computer analysis of data was made through the University of Minnesota Computer Center in terms of descriptive statistics and measures of statistical significance of percentage differences.[3] The coding and punching of data were verified.

Organization of Report

The remainder of this report falls under two main headings: "Findings" and "Summary Conclusions". Under the first heading the information is presented in each of the nine previously cited question-groupings. Within each of these nine areas, comparisons are made between the findings of this study and similar data on faculty at the University of Minnesota.

The second main heading -- Summary Conclusions -- provides a brief review of the significant findings of the study, draws some conclusions, and suggests implications for action and further research.

---

[3] The five percent (.05) level was used in determining statistical significance.

FINDINGS.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Demographic Data

Of the 75 faculty members who responded to the questionnaire, 80 percent were men and 20 percent were women. The University of Minnesota faculty is made up of 82 percent men and 18 percent women; thus, apparently neither sex was significantly more likely than the other to become involved in UMM.

The median age of respondents was 40 years, this being only one year younger than the median age of faculty at the University.

Over three-fourths (78 percent) of the respondents were currently married, and of these most had at least one child, with the number ranging up to five or more children.

Of the 73 faculty members who responded to the item regarding their race, 69 were White, 2 were Black, and 2 were American Indian.

The largest number of respondents (36 percent) reported a basic institutional salary ranging between $15,000 - $19,999.[4] A significant proportion (27 percent) reported incomes of $20,000 - $24,999. A total of 13 percent reported incomes of more than $25,000 per year.

A significant number (73 percent) of the faculty who participated in UMM characterized themselves as politically liberal in their orientation, with 25 percent of the respondents characterizing themselves as very liberal. Contrasted with a national sample of University-level faculty, the respondents characterized themselves as politically liberal approximately one-third more often. (Bayer, 1970, p. 20).

---

4. 12 months.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Status in the University

The largest number (41 percent) of University faculty members who worked with UMI students held the rank of full Professor. 25 percent were Associate Professors, 17 percent Assistant Professors, and 13 percent hold the rank of Instructor. 3 percent held other appointments. Of all respondents, 67 percent reported holding academic appointments which are tenured. Comparative figures for faculty at the University of Minnesota show 30 percent of full Professor rank, 18 percent Associate Professors, and 27 percent Assistant Professors. Thus, it appears that UMI students tend to work with senior level faculty more often than chance would indicate. This phenomena of senior faculty involvement has a number of implications that will be commented on later.

59 percent of the respondents reported holding the Ph.D. as their highest earned credential. This percentage is identical to the overall University of Minnesota figure for faculty holding Ph.D's.

31 percent of the respondents have been employed at the University for four years or less, 27 percent for five to nine years, 16 percent for ten to fifteen years, and 26 percent have served for more than fifteen years. 39 percent have worked only for the University, 25 percent have worked previously for another educational institution, and 36 percent have worked for two or more other institutions. Thus, roughly 61 percent of the respondents have had other collegiate appointments before joining the University. These figures are nearly the same for the general University faculty population.

The vast majority (89 percent) of respondents reported being appointed on a full-time basis at the University. The majority (53 percent) of the respondents teach both undergraduate and graduate level courses, 20 percent teach only on the graduate level, and 11 percent reported that they had no

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teaching responsibilities during the current academic year. Of those who did have teaching responsibilities, 63 percent reported teaching three courses or more, and 28 percent reported teaching more than four courses. Of those who had teaching responsibilities, nearly one-half (45 percent) reported having less than 100 students in their classes. 28 percent reported having 200 or more students in their classes. The respondents' time and energies were further divided by their committee responsibilities; 72 percent reported serving on at least one committee, 45 percent served on two to four committees, and 17 percent reported serving on five to nine committees. The questionnaire, unfortunately, failed to ask faculty to estimate the percentage of time they devoted to teaching activity. Eckert, Williams, and Anderson (1970, p. 5) have observed that the typical University of Minnesota faculty member spends 45 percent of his or her time in teaching activities. A related observation as reported by Hodgkinson is that "As the comprehensiveness of a school increases, commitment toward teaching decreases . . ." (Hodgkinson,1970, p. 83). It would be interesting to discover whether University faculty who participate in UMI differ significantly from these trends away from involvement with students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ATTITUDES ABOUT HIGHER EDUCATION and the UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

The majority (62 percent) of respondents express positive feelings about the University of Minnesota. Of these, nearly one-fourth (24 percent) report feeling very positive about the University. None of the respondents expressed very negative feelings: indeed, only 7 percent reported feelings slightly tending in the negative direction. An even larger number (80 percent) report positive feelings about their own experiences as a student when they went to college.

Granted these positive feelings about the University, a clear majority (86 percent) of the respondents feel that change is needed at the University of Minnesota, and 22 percent report feeling that "drastic change" is needed. This compares with the fact that, of the total University faculty, 83 percent report satisfactory feelings about the University, with 44 percent feeling very satisfied. Although, as reported above, a majority of respondents express positive feelings about the University, and most University faculty report positive feelings about the University, it may be surmised that faculty who have been involved in UMM feel a greater need for change than do other members of the faculty. This hypothesis, however, remains to be tested.

As would be expected, the largest number of respondents (64 percent) express greater interest in teaching as opposed to research; nearly one-fourth (24 percent) report that their interests lie "very heavily" in teaching. Only 11 percent report being more inclined toward research than teaching. 63 percent also agree with the statement, "Teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary criteria for promotion of faculty." A significant number (21 percent) strongly agree

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with the statement. At the same time, one-fourth disagree with the statement, with 10 percent expressing strong disagreement. This affinity for teaching is somewhat surprising given the general research orientation of University of Minnesota faculty (Eckert and Williams, 1972, pp. 20-21).

It is interesting to contrast the above with data gathered on faculty at the national level. 67 percent of faculty at universities in the U.S. agree that teaching, not publications, should be the main criterion for promotion. Thus, University of Minnesota faculty who have been involved in UMM, while more inclined toward teaching than research, apparently are not anymore strongly inclined toward teaching than a national sample of university-level faculty who have (assumedly) not been so involved. (Bayer, 1970, p. 18)

Regarding the type of teaching they prefer, a majority of the respondents (55 percent) prefer a combination of approaches, including classroom lecture, small group seminar, and one-to-one advising on independent study. Of these alternative modes of teaching, the small group seminar is preferred by the largest number of respondents (33 percent). Only 10 percent prefer one-to-one advising - the type most characteristic in UMM.

Nearly one-half (45 percent) of the respondents stated that "learning how to learn" should be the most important goal for undergraduates. The second most frequently cited goal (30 percent) was "attaining a broad liberal education". Thus, the respondents are apparently in agreement with UMM's stated educational mission of developing in persons skills for life-long learning.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RELATIONSHIP WITH UMI

Nearly one-half (48 percent) of the respondents worked with only one UMI student. 29 percent worked with two students, and 23 percent worked with three or more. Recalling the total number of full-time and part-time faculty at the University (4,801), there appears a clear tendency for UMI to work with faculty who have previously been involved with the program. The fact that a majority of respondents worked with more than one student holds a number of possible implications for UMI which will be examined later in this report.

The respondents tended to be persons who had worked with other students (non-UMI) outside of class on an independent study basis: 80 percent report working with one student or more during the current year, and a significant proportion (32 percent) worked with ten students or more. Again, UMI seems to be drawing repeatedly on individual faculty members, and many of these faculty have significant involvements with other students who are pursuing independent study.

In most of the cases (36 percent) the faculty member first heard about UMI from the student. Almost as frequently (33 percent), the faculty member was first contacted by a member of the UMI staff. The fact that as large a figure as 36 percent first heard about UMI from the student is particularly interesting, given that slightly less than one-half of the UMI student body live within commuting distance to campus: most of the students in UMI cannot come to campus to arrange their own contacts with faculty. Even those UMI students who do live within commuting distance have an assortment of barriers (jobs, family responsibilities, etc.) which inhibit their presence on campus. That more than one-third of the initial contacts with faculty were made by students is impressive.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The majority (69 percent) of respondents said they received assistance from the UNM office in working with their students, with 10 percent reporting that they received "much assistance", 39 percent received "some assistance", and 22 percent reporting that they received only "little assistance." These percentages are somewhat lower than the amount of assistance from the UNM office faculty members would prefer to receive: 16 percent would like to work "very closely" with UNM, 67 percent would like "some contact", and only a total of 10 percent report that either "little contact" or "no contact" with UNM is preferred. 7 percent said that the amount of contact with the UNM office depended on the student involved.

One-half the respondents report that they worked either extensively (16 percent) or to a moderate extent (34 percent) in helping their UNM student(s) to design their study plans. 19 percent worked only to a small extent on the student's proposal, and a similar number did not work with the student at all in developing his or her study proposal. A surprisingly large proportion (12 percent) of the respondents report that they never saw a written study proposal; surprising because of UNM's strong emphasis on the development of written study proposals. At the same time, a recent study conducted by the University's Office of Special Learning Opportunities (OSLO) reported that, of 49 faculty from 24 departments who were surveyed, a full 76 percent said they either do not like or do not require a written agreement or agreement or contract, and one-third of the 24 percent who do require a contract do so because the department demands it; others use them only with students they do not know in advance, or because students prefer them(!)..

The findings of the present report differ somewhat from those of the OSLO study: 92 percent of UNM faculty report that they would like to be involved in developing their students' study project proposals; 17 percent report that they wish to be heavily involved, 68 percent would like to be involved to a moderate extent, and 7 percent would prefer to

leave project proposal writing entirely up to the student, and 1 percent believe that proposals aren't necessary. Thus, contrary to the OSLO study, faculty who are involved in UMM appear to prefer written agreements with their students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

On the average, the typical UMM faculty member (43 percent) communicated with their student(s) approximately once per month. 82 percent met at least this often, with 27 percent meeting approximately once every two weeks, and 12 percent meeting at least once per week. By comparison, the OSLO study showed faculty meeting, on the average, two to four times per quarter, with one-third of the faculty averaging five to ten meetings. The most typical mode of communication with students used by UMM faculty was in-person meetings (70 percent), followed by written communication (21 percent), and phone conversations (7 percent). Two-thirds of the respondents report that they meet in-person with their UMM student(s) at least once.

Of the 75 faculty surveyed, 27 (37 percent) had served on a UMM student's Graduation Committee. Such involvement is significantly related to the faculty member's overall assessment of his or her experience in UMM, as will be noted later.

Less than one-fourth of the respondents had contact with a Community Faculty member during their involvement in UMM. A clear majority (69 percent), however, favor the idea of having persons from the non-academic sector serve as temporary faculty for UMM students; indeed, 23 percent strongly favor the idea. 12 percent tend to disfavor the use of Community Faculty, with 3 percent disapproving strongly of the idea.

A related response pattern is faculty members' feelings regarding the award of credit for off-campus experience. While nearly three-fourths (73 percent) of the respondents feel that academic credit should be awarded for certain kinds of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

life or job-related experience, 47 percent agree with reservations. The key here appears to be the phrase, "certain kind"; it is experience that results in demonstrable learning that the faculty view as being worthy of academic credit. 96 percent of the respondents agree that experience, per se, does not warrant credit; learning must be demonstrated.

ROLE DEFINITIONS

Only one-half (51 percent) of the respondents felt certain about their roles and responsibilities in UMM. Of these, 11 percent felt that their roles and responsibilities were very clear, and 40 percent felt clear about their role definitions. It is disconcerting, however, to find 29 percent uncertain about their role, and 17 percent and 3 percent feeling "unclear" or "very unclear", respectively, about their roles and responsibilities in UMM.

When asked to define their role in UMM, the most frequently cited response was the role of, "Facilitator", followed by "Advisor" (25 percent), and "Counselor" (17 percent). 15 percent defined their role with the term "Expert". Interestingly, only 7 percent defined themselves, in terms of their UMM role, as "Teacher". Somewhat paradoxically, most of the respondents, when offered the terms "Generalist" and "Specialist" as alternative role-definitions, chose the latter term. Thus, we may assume that the respondents define their roles in a manner quite similar to the felt roles and responsibilities of UMM Community Faculty -- as facilitators of learning within prescribed subject matter areas (Johnson, '74).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ACADEMIC UNITS

Related to the faculty member's feelings about his or her role-definitions in UMM is the nature of the faculty member's relationship with his or her regular academic unit: Does the department have guidelines regulating independent study; does the department recognize service in UMM as a positive element in the faculty member's case for promotion and tenure, or in another sense does the department recognize such activity as a legitimate part of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities?

Although a majority (52 percent) of the respondents report that their respective departments do have guidelines regulating their involvement in independent study advising, only 32 percent feel that such activity is recognized as a legitimate teaching responsibility. Nearly one-half (46 percent) of the respondents expressly state that such involvement is not recognized. Only 1 respondent, however, felt that the department actively discourages such activity. On the departmental level, there appears to be a posture of neglect (benign or otherwise) of UMM. Indeed, most (70 percent) of the faculty surveyed in the present study said they didn't know how their faculty colleagues in the department felt about UMM.

REMUNERATION FOR SERVICES

At present, University faculty members who work with UMM students do not receive direct remuneration for their services. Although UMM students do pay tuition, and it may be said that this generated income is ultimately distributed by central administration to the academic departments which, in turn, pass on the funds in the form of salaries to the faculty, there is no clear connection between salaries and service in UMM.

It has been assumed that University faculty would desire to receive direct remuneration for their work with UWM students. The present study does not support such an assumption: only 29 respondents agreed with the statement, "Do you think you should receive direct remuneration for your services in UWM?" A similar number (28 percent) are uncertain on the issue, and a full 43 percent gave negative responses. Thus, nearly three-fourths (72 percent) of the faculty surveyed do not support the idea of paying faculty directly for their services in UWM.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

When asked what remuneration plan would be best if one were to be instituted, the respondents displayed no overwhelming preference for any of the four plans (direct payment to faculty; payment to faculty member's respective department; redefining the faculty member's job description to include such advising responsibility, with no payment involved; or rely on individual faculty member's decision whether or not to serve - no payment).

So, in short, the majority of respondents do not favor a remuneration plan, and no single plan had greater appeal than the others.

FEELINGS ABOUT UWM STUDENTS

45 percent of the respondents judged their UWM student's work to be of a higher quality than the work of other undergraduates. 40 percent felt the work of UWM students to be similar to that of other undergraduates, and a total of 15 percent felt UWM students' work was of lower quality. The finding that UWM students tend to a great degree to produce work that is judged to be of higher quality is supported by similar findings in the previously cited OSLO study: students were shown to earn high grades for such out of class study. The present study also supports the OSLO hypothesis that such study is not an "easy grade", but, rather, students tend to do well when learning activity is built on the individual's special talents and interests.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The above findings, as well as those quoted below, must be stated with considerable tentativeness. The reason for hesitancy in interpretation results from the fact that, at the time of the study, only 53 percent of the respondents' students had completed their study projects. 15 percent of the students' projects were still in process, 5 percent of the students didn't submit a project report (although the project may have been completed), and 10 percent of the respondents expressed with certainty that the studentsdid not complete their project. Of those faculty who worked with more than one student, 18 percent reported that some of their students completed their projects while others did not.

While maintaining our caution about hasty interpretations of results, it appears that UWW faculty tend to give positive evaluations of UWW students on a number of variables. 57 percent rated their UWW students as having a greater desire to learn than other students. 46 percent felt that their UWW student possessed greater maturity than other students.[5] On the variables of intelligence and learning skill, UWW faculty rated their students the same as other students. The latter finding is significant given UWW's emphasis on the development of learning skills.

OVERALL FEELINGS ABOUT UWW

The majority (61 percent) of University faculty who participated in UWW expressed positive feelings about their involvement, with 20 percent of these faculty members expressing "very positive" feelings. 30 percent felt neutral about this UWW experience, and a total of 7 percent expressed negative feelings (1 percent feeling strongly negative).

While the majority (51 percent) of the respondents said they felt the same about UWW now as compared with when they first heard about the program, a significant number (32 percent) feel more positive, with 8 percent feeling much more positive. More than three-fourths (77 percent) state that they would like to be involved again in UWW, with 32 percent feeling definitely so.

---

[5] The average age of UWW students is 35 years, which partially accounts for this assessment of their levels of maturity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Significantly related to the respondents' overall feelings about their involvement in UWM are the following variables: the respondent's age; the respondent's assessment of the student's desire to learn; the respondent's assessment of the student's intelligence; the respondent's assessment of the student's maturity level; the frequency of communication with the student; whether the respondent served on a UWM graduation committee; and whether the respondent felt his or her academic department recognized service in UWM as a legitimate teaching responsibility. The implications of these correlations will be discussed in the concluding sections of this report.

A special comment needs to be made here regarding age: a total of 61 percent of the respondents felt positive about their UWM involvement, and 75 percent of the respondents in the 60 years of age and older group expressed positive feelings, with none in this group expressing negative feelings. Those in the 30-39 age group were more uncertain about their UWM involvement than those in the 60 and over group: 41 percent of the former expressed uncertain feelings, while only 25 percent of the latter expressed such feelings of uncertainty. Adding to this trend is the observation that, while none of the respondents in the 60 and over age group expressed negative feelings, 19 percent in the age range 30-49 expressed negative feelings. Less than one-half this number in the 50-59 age group expressed negative feelings.

Further complicating the pattern is the positive feelings toward UWM expressed by those in the youngest age grouping (20-29 years): 75 percent of these youngest faculty members expressed positive feelings. Also, none in this age group expressed negative feelings.

Thus, we may conclude that those respondents in the youngest and oldest age groupings typically felt more positive about their UWM involvement than those in the middle age ranges. The fact that a total of 19 percent in the age range 30-49 expressed negative feelings, while only a total of 8 percent in the two age ranges 20-29 and 60 and over expressed such feelings appears significant.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAIN FINDINGS

The main findings of this study are:

University faculty participants in UNH are likely to be of senior rank (Professor and Associate Professor).

On other demographic variables, UNH faculty do not differ significantly from the University faculty at large.

UNH faculty participants express greater interest in teaching than research and the majority feel that a faculty member's teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary criterion for promotion and tenure.

Only 10 percent of the faculty prefer to rely only on the UNH model of one-to-one advising of the sort provided in UNH; most prefer a combination of teacher-student patterns of interaction.

The majority of respondents are in agreement with UNH's goals of helping students to "learn how to learn" and achieving a liberal education, as opposed to the narrower objectives of learning within a discipline or learning a specific vocational skill.

The majority of respondents worked with more than one UNH student, and there is a tendency for individual University faculty members to be repeatedly contacted for service in UNH.

University faculty who work with UNH students typically have worked with other (non-UNH students) on an independent study basis.

In spite of their barriers to on-campus learning, UNH students frequently initiate the first contact with their University faculty advisors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University faculty typically want a closer working relationship with the UWW central office than has been provided.

Written study contracts are not unanimously viewed by faculty as necessary: indeed, a vast majority apparently would prefer a more flexible approach.

If a study proposal is to be written, 92 percent of the faculty said they would like to be involved in proposal development, with most, however, preferring to be involved only to a moderate extent.

Most faculty met in-person with their UWW students at least once, and most faculty communicated with their student roughly once per month.

The most frequent method of student-faculty communication was in-person meetings, with written communications a distant second.

Respondents are in general agreement with the ideas of awarding credit for demonstrated learning derived from off-campus experience and with the idea of using persons from the non-academic sector as temporary faculty.

Roughly one-half of the University faculty who worked with UWW students felt uncertain about their roles and responsibilities in UWW.

Respondents tended to define their UWW role as a facilitator of learning within prescribed subject-matter areas; they did not feel themselves to be "teachers".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A minority of respondents feel that their regular academic department recognizes their services in UMM as a legitimate part of their teaching responsibility, although most feel that their departments do not actively discourage such service.

Most faculty do not wish to be remunerated for their service in UMM, nor do they have a preference for any given plan of remuneration (or recognition) for their UMM involvement.

The respondents tend to perceive UMM students as being more mature and eager to learn than other students, and these characteristics (and the characteristic of intelligence) are positively related to faculty's feelings about UMM in general.

Faculty frequently evaluate their UMM students' work to be of higher quality than the work of other undergraduates.

A clear majority of faculty who worked with UMM students expressed positive feelings about their involvement in the program and most feel they would like to be involved in the future.

A significant number of respondents feel more positive now about UMM as compared to when they first heard about the program: only a few expressed more negative feelings.

Faculty in the youngest and oldest age categories felt most positive about their UMM experience: those in the middle range tended to feel less positive.

Faculty who served on a UMM Graduation Committee tended to feel more positive about UMM overall than those who did not have this experience.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IMPLICATIONS FOR ACTION

What are the implications of these data for UMM? What courses of action in terms of University faculty involvement in UMM appear justified? A few of the more salient implications are provided below.

The factor of faculty age and its relationship to University faculty involvement in UMM seems of special importance. The median age of American college faculty is getting older, fewer younger persons are joining the academic ranks, and we may expect the University of Minnesota to be no exception to this pattern. It has also been observed through studies of faculty mobility that aging faculty are less likely to move (Bayer, 1974). The faculty we have now at the University will be the faculty we must work with in the future.

In view of the above, it is somewhat comforting to find faculty in the older age category to feel positive about UMM. At the same time, the larger proportion of negative feelings about UMM expressed by middle-aged faculty seems some cause for concern. Also of concern is the possibility that as faculty move from the youngest age group (which also expresses positive attitudes toward UMM) into their middle years, the priorities and pressures of their respective academic professions and related departmental concerns will dominate. Indeed, while the younger faculty member's positive feelings about UMM may be related to his or her inclination to identify with the concerns of students (the young faculty member recently being, or possibly still being, a student him/herself), such feelings of identification may reduce over time. The data in the present study tends to support

this hypothesis. On the other end of the spectrum is the older faculty member, inclined positively toward UMM, but possibly in need of new experiences, roles, and other opportunities for renewal.[6]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In view of the above, plus this report's finding that over one-half of the faculty surveyed felt unclear about their roles and responsibilities in UMM, it would seem useful for UMM to develop new ways of helping University faculty to understand their obligations in UMM. While written materials may be of some use, the study findings do not clearly support the development of more rigorous requirements which govern the student-faculty relationship, although respondents would like somewhat greater involvement in the planning of study projects. The study does support the development of closer working relationships between faculty and the UMM office: faculty are telling UMM that they need more assistance from the program than they received. UMM needs to acknowledge this need and develop its program accordingly.

The findings of the study also indicate that UMM needs to seek UMM involvement among a broader range of University faculty. The central staff needs to avoid the temptation of recruiting only those faculty members who have previously participated. While most of the faculty surveyed expressed a desire to be involved in UMM again in the future, UMM needs to be aware of the risks of calling too frequently upon its faculty allies. Broader faculty involvement also is justified in terms of UMM's mission as an all-University agent for change: involvement of faculty from many academic units is central to this mission.

---

6 The "publish or perish" pressures which particularly affect younger faculty, and the phenomenon of older faculty member's concern with the personal growth of students is documented in a number of studies (for example, Warren, J., Varieties of Academic Performance, Educational Testing Service, Oakland: 1972 pp 38-40.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UHH should consider abandoning the contract approach to regulating student-faculty interaction, while still requiring written proposals of study. The practice of having the student work out on paper his or her study questions, methods, resources, etc., is useful and necessary; it appears, however, that to require the proposal to be re-articulated in the form of a student-faculty contract goes against the sort of flexibility of approach that faculty (and students) prefer.

UHH should consider the findings regarding student-faculty modes of communication which seem to indicate that distant students are not receiving as much attention from their University faculty advisors as do students who reside within commuting distance. The finding that in-person meetings were by far the most frequent mode of interaction, coupled with the fact that roughly 50 percent of UHH students can't usually come to campus, can be interpreted to mean that distant UHH students are being short-changed. This requires further investigation.

UHH should temporarily halt its plans to implement a scheme for remuneration of University faculty for their services in UHH until further information can be gathered. At present there is insufficient argument in favor of immediate implementation of any given plan of recognizing such faculty involvement; nor, indeed, is there agreement on whether faculty should be paid at all.

The program needs to initiate efforts toward raising its visibility on campus. Most respondents didn't know how their faculty colleagues felt about UHH. Such lack of conversation about UHH within the academic units of the University is disconcerting, and actions should be taken to provide greater inputs at this level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As was mentioned at the beginning, the main limitation of the present study is that it fails to provide data on how UHM students evaluate the faculty with whom they worked. Clearly, this remains a rich area for study.

The study also lacked certain statistical analyses which would have been useful. At present, for example, we do not know whether there are causal relationships between UHM students' characteristics and the nature of the respondents' overall assessment of their experience in UHM. Similarly, we do not know if faculty interact more frequently with their students because they like the idea of UHM or if the reverse causal connection is the case. Such "chicken or the egg" types of problems need analysis.

Another important area for further study concerns faculty member's role as a facilitator of learning within a specified subject area. How is such a role operationalized? What possible tensions exist? Is such a self-definition of role by faculty an accurate one? These questions are fascinating and beg continued efforts to find answers.

It is hoped the present study will provide a useful basis for such continued inquiry into the important topic of faculty in UHM.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Bayer, A.E., College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description, American Council on Education, 1970.

Bayer, A.E.,"College Faculties: 'Le Plus Ca Change'", Change, March, 1974.

Eckert, R., and H. Williams, College Faculty View Themselves and Their Jobs, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1972.

Eckert, R., and H. Williams and D. Anderson: The University of Minnesota Faculty: Who Serves and Why, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1970

Feldman, K., and T. Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco 1969.

Johnson, J., Community Faculty in the University Without Walls: University of Minnesota, Unpublished Monograph, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1974.

Mayhew, L., and P. Ford, Changing the Curriculum, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1973.

Peterson, N ., "Directed Study: How Instructors See It", Comment, Center for Educational Development, University of Minnesota, June 1974.

Warren, J., Varieties of Academic Performance, Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, 1972.